

37. The method of claim 1, wherein the nerve-related vision disorder is dry eye degeneration.

38. The method of claim 1, wherein the mammal is human.--

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants take this opportunity to thank Examiners Owens and Geist for their courtesy and time in conducting an interview with Applicant Douglas T. Ross and Applicants' counsel on November 28, 2000. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with discussions held during the interview. It was agreed that the amendments would overcome the §112, first and second paragraph rejections, and place the application in condition for allowance.

REMARKS

Claim 5 has been canceled, claims 1, 7, and 11 have been amended, and new claims 24-38 have been added to describe the inventive subject matter more clearly. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-4, 6-11, and 23-38 are pending in the application.

The amendments do not introduce new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132. Basis for the claim amendments is found on page 15, line 3 to page 16, line 11, page 33, line 22 to page 42, line 2, page 68, line 1 to page 101, line 13; in claims 1, 5, and 7 as

originally filed; and elsewhere throughout the specification and claims. In part, the amendment of claim 1 incorporates the limitations of canceled claim 5. The amendments to the Specification remove potential ambiguity in the designation of the Tables themselves and in the references to the tables, as found in the text of the Specification and in the claims as originally filed. The amendment to claim 11 has been made to describe the claimed subject matter more clearly, particularly compounds 1-138 of the invention. Accordingly, entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-11 and 23
under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

A. Scope of Enablement for vision disorders

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the claimed range of visual disorders in sufficiently diverse *in vivo* systems. The Examiner concludes that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims without undue experimentation.

As was agreed during the interview on November 28, 2000, the amendments to claim 1, adding "nerve-related", replacing "animal"

with "mammal", and including the limitations of canceled claim 5 in claim 1, further describing the vision disorders to be treated, overcome this rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. Enablement for Treatment of a Memory Disorder

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement for treatment of a memory disorder in diverse animal species, and for treating Alzheimer's Disease, amnesia, and Korsakoff's syndrome specifically.

As was agreed during the interview on November 28, 2000, the state of the art discussed during the interview, as well as the amendments to claim 1, replacing "animal" with "mammal", overcome this rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**2. Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112,
second paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "compounds 1-25, 27, 28, 31-33, and 35-136 of Tables I, II, and III". Applicants have amended claim 11 to specifically set forth compounds 1-136, which are disclosed in the Specification.

Compounds 1-136 fall within the scope of the genus of claim 7, from which claim 11 depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing amendments and remarks, the presently claimed subject matter is definite, enabled, and patentably distinguishable over the art of record. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-11 and 23, and allow all pending claims presented herein for reconsideration. Favorable action with an early allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if he has any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC

Dated: December 5, 2000

By: 

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
1030 Fifteenth Street, NW
Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 775-8383
Facsimile: (202) 775-8396
GMN:TLJ:LCH RFR.wpd

Gary M. Nath
Reg. No. 26,965
Todd L. Juneau
Reg. No. 40,669
Customer No. 20529